1-1-1975

# A descriptive study of the status of special education teacher training programs at the state colleges and University, within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Chapter 766.

Kathleen McArdle
*University of Massachusetts Amherst*

# A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE STATUS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS AT THE STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY, WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, RELATIVE TO CHAPTER 766

A Dissertation

By

Kathleen McArdle

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1975

Major Subject: Special Education

# A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE STATUS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS AT THE STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY, WITHIN THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, RELATIVE TO CHAPTER 766

A Dissertation

By

Kathleen McArdle

Approved as to style and content by:

Patrick J. Sullivan, Chairperson

Horace Reed, Member

J. Gregory Olley, Member

Pamela J. Mills, Dean's Representative

Louis Fischer
Acting Dean, School of Education

May 1975

# DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my family and friends without whose constant support and encouragement this task would never have been accomplished.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This writer would like to express her indebtedness and appreciation for the cooperation of many individuals who contributed invaluable assistance to this study. Their cooperation, guidance, and advice significantly aided the completion of this study. These individuals include:

Members of the dissertation committee:

Associate Professor Patrick J. Sullivan

Professor Horace B. Reed

Assistant Professor J. Gregory Olley

Assistant Professor Pamela J. Mills

Assistant Professor Robert D. Jackson

The entire special education staff whose constant encouragement and feedback was invaluable.

The students in special education who contributed in many ways to the completion of this task.

The chairpersons of special education departments at the state colleges without whose assistance and cooperation this study could never have been done.

Joyce C. Page and Carolina A. Diaz for their editing skills and invaluable support.

My parents, sisters, and brothers-in-law whose faith and support was an invaluable aid for completion of this task.

Robert G. Pflueger, for his patience and understanding

when the road became difficult.

Robert D. Jackson, who afforded me this opportunity and without whose support the completion of this task would have been impossible.

A Descriptive Study of the Special Education Teacher Training Programs at the State Colleges and University within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Relative To Chapter 766 (May 1975)

Kathleen McArdle, B.S., Rhode Island College
M.A., George Washington University
Directed by: Dr. Patrick J. Sullivan

As a result of the passage of Chapter 766, questions arise concerning the extent to which the recommended educational practices are implemented. In this research, the specific dimensions of this problem that have been identified and evaluated concern: (1) The programmatic changes implemented at the State Institutions of Higher Education, (2) Development of new training features in the program since the Mandate was passed; and (3) Effect of select variables on changing educational practices instigated by the passage of Chapter 766.

To this end, a questionnaire was developed for the purpose of collecting information on Special Education teacher training programs at State Colleges within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and distributed to the eight chairpersons of Special Education departments at these Institutions. The Institutions included: Boston State College, Bridgewater, Fitchburg, University of Massachusetts/ Amherst, North Adams, Westfield, and Worcester State Colleges.

The questionnaire data was analyzed and discussed according to the following areas: (1) Demography; (2) Program Practices - encompassing the past practices prior to 1972, current 1974-1975 methods, and the resulting changes; (3) Compliance of Chapter 766 Adherence focusing on incentives for acceptance and limitations prohibiting acceptance; and (4) Other Variables Affecting Acceptance and Implementation of Chapter 766.

The degree to which the State Institutions have accepted and implemented educational change, varies. Seven of the eight Institutions now incorporate non-categorical or generic training in their operational models. All Institutions indicated a need to alter their training programs as a result of Chapter 766.

An inhibiting factor to program development appears to be the lack of defined certification requirements prior to January 1975. Seven of the eight Institutions indicated that this was a hinderance to further program implementation. Despite this fact, two Institutions have incorporated only non-categorical training models as their program offering.

Two demographic variables were considered where comparisons were made between Institutions with respect to program change generated since the passage of Chapter 766. They were the size of the student population and the percentage of faculty holding terminal degrees. The Institutions with less than half the faculty holding terminal

degrees appear to have made greater changes in their programs.

The Institutions with smaller Special Education student populations had more innovative programs. The larger colleges appear to have had more difficulty changing the direction of program offerings.

Change is occurring at the State Institutions of Higher Education and greater change can be forecast for the future, considering the newly defined certification requirements.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

> Although equal educational opportunity has been affirmed as the political, legal, and moral right of all individuals, our schools for the most part are characterized by lack of equality of educational opportunity. Too many children in our society are deprived of their educational rights because they are economically disadvantaged or different from the white middle-class population for whom the standards of education were traditionally established. If we are to attain our objectives of equal educational opportunity for all children, the prejudices -- whether subtle or overt -- against poverty, minority groups, and children who are different must be eliminated, and the organization and conduct of schooling must be changed. (Reynolds, 1971, p. xvi)

Much of the research conducted during the past ten years has indicated that children who are economically disadvantaged and from minority status have been denied the same educational opportunities as their counterparts. Research results indicate how large numbers of these children have been unjustly excluded from regular classroom settings as a result of identification processes that were more concerned with applying labels than remediating children's specific learning and/or behavior problems. Furthermore, these labeling and exclusion practices gave rise to other negative effects resulting in intrapersonal difficulties that further impair the educational and personal growth of students. For example, as a by-product of the stigmatization inherent in such placement, it has been shown the students placed in Special Education classes over an extended period

of time developed negative self-concepts, exhibited significant decreases in achievement levels, and manifested deviant behaviors not apparent prior to such placement (Meyerowitz, 1967). The aforementioned concerns plus a host of other controversial issues related to the delivery of equal educational opportunities for all children have been instrumental in shaping in the current transition in Special Education toward a modification of teaching and placement practices.

As a result of court actions in the latter 1960's and early 1970's, educators witnessed an unparalleled movement to restate the legal educational rights of Children with Special Needs. Plaintiffs in many of these court actions used the Fourteenth Amendment to support charges that Children with Special Needs had been denied their constitutional right to equal educational opportunities (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1971). Other plaintiffs noted that criterion measurements utilized for Special Education placement of Economically Disadvantaged and Minority students were likewise inadequate and tended to perpetuate subtle forms of institutional racism (Diana v. State Board of Education, 1970). These individual court cases and class action suits throughout the United States established precedents, with implications far beyond their immediate geographical jurisdictions. Consequently, state legislatures were compelled to design and implement public

laws that negated the debilitating effects of Special Education placement on Children with Special Needs and public laws that insured all students of their constitutional right to equal educational opportunities. These laws have resulted in the current national movement to alter and enhance the educational services rendered to students identified as having special needs by placing them in the least restrictive learning environment possible. For the most part, the least restrictive learning environment is the regular classroom atmosphere which minimizes any stigmatizing effects the children might feel as a result of their learning and/or behavior difficulties.

Six states pioneered the concept of least restrictive placement and included least restrictive clauses in their legislation. Alabama [Sec. 8, Chapter 106, 1971], Arizona [Sec. 5, Chapter 181, 1973], Colorado [Sec. 123-22-4, Revised Statuted, 1972], Massachusetts [Sec. 502.1 Chapter 766, 1972], Tennessee [Chapter 839, Sec. 2B, Laws of 1972], and Wisconsin [Sec. 115.337, Sec. 1 WSA, 1973]. All contain provisions mandating the permanent retention of Special Needs Students in the regular classroom setting for the vast majority of their learning activities. The language used in Colorado's legislation readily serves as an example of the types of statements made in other laws and the focus on least restrictive placement. It states: " . . . Handicapped children should be educated in regular classrooms,

in so far as practicable, and should be assigned to special classrooms only when the nature of the child's handicap makes inclusion of the child in the regular classroom impossible."

Although the six states mentioned pioneered the actual inclusion of least restrictive clauses in their legislation, the decisions rendered as a result of the individual court actions (as stated earlier) prompted the current focus on mainstreaming Children with Special Needs. This enables Special Needs Students to be physically present and learning in the same classroom environment along with "Non" Special Needs Students.

From the research results and various legal mandates presented in recent years, there is a pressing need for special educators and regular educators to view Children with Special Needs with a renewed perspective. This re-examination must concentrate on perceiving such children as individuals rather than labels and must concentrate on developing those strategies which will maintain these children in regular classroom settings. Subsequently, a mass re-education of existing teachers and students contemplating entrance into the field is necessary. Clearly, it is no longer desirable or feasible to continue preparing teachers to instruct select groups that might be labeled "mentally retarded," "emotionally disturbed," or any other such category that connotes isolated services. Teachers already in the field will need

comprehensive inservice training which must be executed on a cross-categorical basis; enabling prospective and practicing teachers to have a broader base of knowledge and repertoire of skills applicable to both Special Needs and Non-Special Needs Children.

The present study concerns itself with the implications for developing revised teacher training methods to deal with Special Needs Children as a result of the Massachusetts Public Law, Chapter 766--hereafter referred to as Chapter 766. The legislature of Massachusetts passed the Bartley/Daley Act (Chapter 766) in July of 1972, and mandated its implementation in September 1974.

Chapter 766 concerns many of the points referred to earlier in this chapter, such as classification, labeling, placement, and teacher education. Following are some of the key issues as stated in the law.

> . . . It is the purpose of this act to provide for a flexible and uniform system of special education program opportunities for all children requiring special education; to provide a flexible and non-discriminatory system for identifying and evaluating the individual needs of the child and adequacy of the special education program before placement and periodic evaluation of the benefit of the program to the child and the nature of the child's needs thereafter; and to prevent denials of equal educational opportunity on the basis of national origin, sex, economic status, race, religion and physical or mental handicap in the provision of differential education services.
>
> --Chapter 766 - Section I

The law delineates the types of services to be provided, in order of their priority: (Chapter 71E - Section 2)

1. Additional direct or indirect instruction, consultation service, materials, equipment, or aid provided to the regular classroom teachers which directly benefits children requiring special education
2. Supplementary individual or small group instruction or treatment in conjunction with a regular classroom program
3. Integrated programs in which children are assigned to special resource classrooms but attend regular classes to the extent that they are able to function therein
4. Full-time special class placement or treatment in a public school building
5. Teaching or treatment at home
6. Full-time teaching or treatment in a special day school or other facility
7. Teaching or treatment at a hospital
8. Teaching or treatment at a short or long term residential school
9. Occupational and pre-occupational training in conjunction with the regular occupational training in conjunction with full-time special class teaching in a public school building, at home, special day school or other day facility, hospital or short or long term residential school

10. Any combination or modification of programs (1) through (9) or other programs, services, treatments or experimental provisions which obtain the prior approval of the (special education department)

And further, in direct reference to teacher training, this law mandates the Division of Special Education to:

..... Cooperate with and assist public and private colleges and universities within the Commonwealth in developing courses and programs best designed to prepare graduates to serve the educational requirements of children requiring special education.

--Section I M (8)

Chapter 766 mandates more appropriate delivery systems for Children with Special Needs. It is also apparent that many changes in our present teacher preparation modus operandi must be implemented in accordance with this law. If, indeed, we are moving towards a more generic approach in meeting the needs of exceptional children, then our university training programs must reflect this.

The present investigation focuses on the extent to which the training programs at the state colleges within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts reflect the spirit and mandate of Chapter 766. This mandate has a direct bearing upon the future directions of special education programs at all of the institutes of higher education within the state.

It is incumbent upon the state institutions of higher education to cooperate and facilitate compliance with Chapter 766. From an informal survey taken last year to

substantiate the present study, it was found that department heads are changing the direction and focus of their special education teacher training programs. There are a few factors involved in this change which are important in understanding the dilemmas in which some programs find themselves. One vital consideration is the lack of personnel at the university level trained in a Non-categorical program.

Efforts in Non-categorical Teacher Training have been made by a small number of universities since 1966; therefore, only a limited number of personnel have been trained in this area. Although the number of institutions training teachers in a Non-categorical area is increasing, the number is still relatively small. Another important factor is the length of time the programs at the state institutions have been training teachers in Special Education. Most of the departments have been deeply entrenched in the categorical areas and must now shift gears and change program direction and focus. Questioning and changing the practices effectuated over the years is of course a difficult task.

## Significance of the Investigation

This investigation constitutes an attempt to investigate the impact of a legislative mandate - Chapter 766 - on training teachers of Students with Special Needs in state supported teacher training institutions. Chapter 766 was passed by the legislature of Massachusetts in July of 1972.

A two year grace period was given for implementation in order for school systems and university personnel to design alternative delivery systems. This study examined what has transpired at the state institutions, two years after the passage of Chapter 766, and the extent to which the educational leaders accepted the responsibility of the mandate for change.

## Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of Chapter 766 on the Special Education teacher training programs at the state colleges and universities within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Subsumed under this broad purpose was:

> To comprehensively describe the present status of teacher training programs relative to the implicit changes needed in order to implement Chapter 766.

To this end the question is raised: Does the current training of teachers for Children with Special Needs reflect adherence and fulfillment of the Chapter 766 mandate?

## Dimensions for Resolution

Chapter 766 provides nine directives for educating Children with Special Needs, emphasizing the most productive and least restrictive alternative for each child. To assess

the capability of Special Education programs acquainting their future teachers with a wide range of options. Consideration of the following dimensions of the initial problem, seem relevant:

1. What programmatic changes have been implemented at the state institutions of higher education?
   A. What existed prior to 1972?
   B. What practices exist since the passage and acceptance of the mandate?
   C. What significant differences exist during these time frames in the training procedures for those preparing to teach Special Need Students?
2. What new training features in the program have been developed as a result of the passage of Chapter 766?
   A. What have the colleges effectuated in their training programs to adhere to the mandate?
   B. What incentives have been provided to help seek additional training?
   C. What limitations have prohibited adherence to Chapter 766?
3. Are any significant variables related to the ease or difficulty with which colleges are implementing new components of the program?

## Scope and Limitations

This study investigated the effect Chapter 766 has had upon the direction of Special Education teacher training programs. The data sources are the state colleges and university, since these institutions have a direct responsibility to respond to the needs and mandates of the state. Only the programs operating for the academic year 1974-1975 are considered in this study.

Private institutions within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are not included in this study due to the indirect nature of the effect Chapter 766 has upon them. Since they are not state supported institutions, they have only an indirect responsibility to meet the needs of the state, whereas, state institutions have a direct responsibility to respond to the needs of the state.

## Definition of Terms

1. Children with Special Needs - globally describes those children previously defined as handicapped by Bureau of Education of the Handicapped standards, (i.e., mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled, hearing impaired, speech impaired, visually impaired, crippled and other health impaired).
2. Categorical - the training of teachers as well as the classifying of children in a specific area defined by terminology based upon the psycho-medical model, (i.e.,

mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed).

3. Mainstreaming - the creation of educational programs, in the least restrictive manner, within the confines of a regular classroom for children perceived to have learning and/or behavior problems - accompanied by supportive services.
4. Non-categorical - a philosophy which promotes keeping children within the mainstream of school activity versus isolation in a segregated self-contained special class.
5. Integration - the mainstreaming of Children with Special Needs into a non-handicapped population.
6. Cross-categorical - a special education teacher training process with a broader base of knowledge and repertoire of skills transferable to regular classroom settings.
7. Key personnel - the chairpersons of the departments of special education at State Colleges and University.

## Organization of the Presentation

The second chapter examines the research in three areas. It first presents an historical overview of general and special education teacher training. Emanating from the historical overview, a natural progression follows to the reasons or impetus for change. With the foundation being set, the third area of the review discusses the current trends in special education teacher training as well as

alternative operational teacher training models.

The procedure used to collect information in the existing Special Education teacher training programs is the focus of the third chapter. A detailed explanation of the questionnaire used for collecting and processing the data is also included.

The content of the fourth chapter incorporates the presentation of the data collected from the state colleges and university which have Special Education teacher training programs. Discussion is centered around an analysis of the data as well as a comparative study presenting similarities and differences in the training programs under study.

The fifth chapter presents the summary and conclusions emanating from the data. Recommendations for further research into the direction of training programs is also included in this chapter.

# C H A P T E R I I

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

An accurate assessment of the status of the training of teachers for the Special Education profession is provided by considering past and present practices in training programs. Toward this end this literature review covers the following areas:

1. The historical overview of general and special education training programs.
2. The impetus for change.
3. Current trends and alternative models for special education teacher training.

### The Historical Overview

The formalized training of teachers began in the 1850's with the development of Normal Schools and Institutes to supplement community requests for instructors trained to educate their young people. The Landgrant College Act of 1862 (also known as the Morrill Act) established Institutions for the training of persons in the practical arts area. Agriculture and Mechanical Colleges also grew in response to the rising numbers of middle class citizens who desired such an education. Teacher training programs proliferated along these practical lines as well (Tyler, 1971).

Beginning in the 1880's and continuing through the years

following World War I, summer courses and Institutes of an inservice nature were organized as it became increasingly necessary to educate teachers who had been limited to Normal School experiences. These Institutes focused on methodology, techniques, and emerging innovative theories in education.

In 1936, teachers enrolled in The Ohio State University Six Week Summer Institute participated in the first in-service workshop held at the university level for teachers, where additional instruction was given to help teacher to develop the skills necessary to plan instructional resource units and to implement new techniques and methods, in their classrooms (Tyler, 1971).

The stage for innovation in teacher training was now set. Practitioners were further encouraged to learn new techniques in response to the current theories and practices were advocated about educating children. The development of Special Education training programs proved to be no exception. At the turn of the century, teachers of exceptional children followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, the regular elementary and secondary school teachers. Special Education teachers, too, were enrolled in alleged comprehensive training programs for their particular speciality. However, the psycho-medical approach to the education of special or handicapped children dominated the Special Education teacher training programs. Practitioners were taught to diagnose, label, and treat children who had academic or

behavioral problems.

A study of teacher training catalogues throughout the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic state teacher colleges (Aiello, 1974) indicated that as recently as 1962 and continuing through the 1970's, the organization of training programs in Special Education replicated the courses of study required for elementary education majors. Courses dealing with materials and methods and the "teaching of . . . " were copied wholesale by Special Education teacher trainers. Little difference existed between the skills needed for elementary education and the talents required for special education training. Course titles were applied with additional labels so that "The Teaching of Arithmetic" became "The Teaching of Arithmetic to the Retarded Child." Special Education teachers were trained to teach groups of children who were labeled as educable mentally retarded, deaf, blind, and later, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled in the same way as education majors were instructed to teach primary, intermediate, or secondary school students.

Yet, there were quiet rumblings of discontent. As early as 1931, Margaret Compton, a teacher of the feeble-minded in the Montgomery County Maryland School System, wrote: "We must begin to see our children as the distinctly different individuals that normal pupils are. As teachers we must train ourselves in new methods to accomplish this end [p. 91."

In 1932, Bennett questioned the bastions of Special Education through her research findings. Comparing mentally handicapped students with children of similar ability who remained in regular classes, she found that after one year's time, those "handicapped" children who remained in the regular class scored significantly higher on measures of academic achievement. Similar studies by Kirk (1964), Pertsch (1936), Ross, Cohen, and DeYoung (1973), and Vaac (1968, 1972) have yielded results coinciding with the early Bennett studies. A child's placement in a Special Education class did not assure academic improvement greater than that of those children of similar abilities who were not placed in Special Education programs.

In addition, many research findings strongly suggested that a child's developing a "positive sense of self" was adversely affected by his/her placement in a Special Education class (Binet & Simon, 1961; Combs & Harper, 1962; Dunn, 1968; Jones, 1972; Meyerowitz, 1965; Reger, Schroeder, & Uschold, 1968; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

In recent years, legislative bodies have acknowledged the importance of these results. The combination of damage to self-concept and lowered levels of achievement of the children segregated in special classes prompted state legislatures to enact laws to prohibit the psychological and academic impairment of their young citizens.

## The Impetus for Change

By 1960, experts believed that there were no defensible advantages for the continued proliferation of Special Education classes (Blatt, 1960). Special Education programs and classes had finally won a place in the bureaucracy of the educational establishment and continued to grow.

In 1969, a school system in North Sacramento, California began to return educable mentally retarded students to regular classrooms (Bradfield, Brown, Kaplan, Rickert, & Stannard, 1973). Sacramento educators felt that success for these students would be maximized through specific modifications in the regular classroom program. Yet, they also felt that there was no advantage to returning Special Needs Children en masse without planning an organized effort to provide inservice training to those same teachers who initially had rejected the students. Results from educational efforts in Sacramento showed how modifying the regular classroom procedures of individualized instruction and specific instructional objectives; Special Class Children benefit as much or more than those students who remained in self-contained special classes.

Studies conducted over the last ten years support the notion that the traditional self-contained Special Education class should be disbanded in favor of educational settings in which children learn in integrated environments alongside

their "normal" peers.

Garrison and Hammill (1970) studied eleven year old educable mentally retardates in 100 different school settings. Twenty-five percent of the children classified as handicapped passed on either four or five criteria which indicated normalcy on the part of their regular classroom counterparts. A surprising 43% passed on either two or three criteria while 31% passed on one or more. In addition, it was found that classes for the educable mentally retarded were frequently not remedial but were watered down versions of the regular class program. The authors concluded that resource rooms, learning center, and diagnostic work would enhance the learning experiences and resultant achievement levels of those children segregated in self-contained special education classes.

Nelson and Schmidt (1971) found that special educators relying on the past experiences of general educators had a rich history of incorporating other disciplines, sets of learning experiences, and various courses of study into training programs, without planned and careful consideration.

Iano (1972) found that even within Special Education classes there was little homogenity. Some "retarded" students displayed no learning disabilities while others displayed problems nearly identical to those children who attended regular classes. Little homogenity existed within disability groups.

In this same vein Divoky (1974) in reviewing programs for learning disabled children, uncovered a gross misuse of identification procedures and testing battery results. Meeting the children at their own ability level, regardless of the placement, was the suggested course of action.

Educational researchers have concluded that continuing special education classes warrants modifying the entry and exit process must be modified so that special classes do not imprison those students they serve. Along these lines, Grosenick (1971) recommended that a crucial component on any special class placement must be the planning for the child's return to the regular class as soon as feasible, while Gallagher (1972) supported a contractual agreement. These contracts were to be signed by both parents and teachers, included specified goals and time lines (not to exceed two years), and contained a limited renewal clause so that children were not confined indefinitely to existing self-contained special programs.

Exits from a special class should be as systematic as entry into one (Kolstoe, 1972) and if special education programs are to exist in any capacity, teachers must establish performance levels for each child, which are to be met within a specified time limit. In addition, the special class teacher should be held accountable for the attainment of academic and behavioral goals for special class children.

The impetus for change within Special Education programs prompted special educators to postulate alternatives to the traditional self-contained special class. Recommendations included the specialist's participation as part of an interdisciplinary team (Rusalem, 1959), a learning resource center to include a program of perspective teaching techniques supportive services to the regular class teacher (Valett, 1970), and an experimental resource room to service, consistently, children with behavioral disturbances (Glavin, Quay, Annesley, Werry, 1971). Budoff's (1972) recommendation that special education programs can and should be provided without the establishment of self-contained special classes was supported by Reynolds and Balow (1972) suggesting that special education teachers should come from the shadows and provide resource services to the teachers within the school building. Services that qualify as "special" should be delivered in terms of a continuation of educational options with the special educator adapting her/his role to that of an internal consultant assisting the regular classroom teacher (Burello, Tracy, & Schultz, 1973). Knoblock (1973) generalized that: "Any learning environment is incomplete unless the needs and the concerns of teachers as well as children are valued and responded to . . . [p. 346]."

## Current Trends and Alternative Models for Special Education Teacher Training

Since research indicates that traditional self-contained

special classes are not viable options for the delivery of educational services to Exceptional Children, the implications for Special Education teacher training programs become critically obvious. As stated earlier, research findings suggest that special classes should be disbanded in favor of less segregated, non-categorical services. Special Education teachers must be trained to provide special services in settings other than the segregated special class.

Roos (1970) believed that special children should be exposed to and immersed in situations as close to the conditions and patterns of those found in mainstream society. He also noted the few innovations in curriculum and methodology at the training specialists for the education of Special Children.

Prouty and Prillaman (1970) strongly advocated a restructuring of Special Education teacher training curriculum to include the training of a Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teacher responsible for providing services to classroom teachers using innovative methods and materials.

Hurley (1971) discussed the categorical/non-categorical issue in Special Education, and its implication for teacher training. He suggested that a non-categorical special program could produce a major impact on program organization at all levels of teacher education. Declassification, the advent of non-categorical programs, would, in Hurley's words, "force special education to focus on the variety of ways to

teach the impaired [p. 42]." Hurley also supported the following two-pronged focus for training Special Educators: (1) a combination of advances in inservice programs with changes in preservice training practices to insure accountability and (2) new models to enhance classroom and community experiences that will focus special programs within and without the school.

Lilly (1971) recommended a new role for Special Educators. He saw the specialist as the educator who provided a supportive service to and for regular classroom teachers. It was crucial, Lilly continued, that specialists work to enhance the skills which regular class teachers already possess, so that they would be equipped to handle the special situations that many special children present. The specialist must be the supportive element in the success of special children within regular classrooms and potential Special Education teachers must be taught to provide the needed support.

Lilly's training based model provided for direct training to the classroom teacher as well as the specialist. The specialist would aid the referred child's classroom teacher in dealing with the classroom as it already existed; at no time would the child be removed. Lilly advocated change in special education so that services were no longer child centered but revolved around the child's relationship with her/his classroom teacher. Lilly noted implications for

teacher training programs in that the traditional Special Educator would be trained as an "instructional specialist." The instructional specialist would be equipped by teacher trainers, with a "bag of tricks" or a set of general skills that were easily translatable into the regular classroom setting. The Special Education Department in Lilly's brave new educational world offered training to all potential teachers in any area of education, special, general, and training as "instructional specialists" for the practitioner.

Christoplos and Valletutti (1972) supported a non-categorical field competency model for the preparation of Special Education teachers. Specific competencies would be identified and field experience, both real and simulated, would be designed for teacher development of a new Special Education role. This program would open the lines of communication between colleges and school systems enabling teachers trained as generic specialists providing support to teachers for the maintenance of Special Class children within regular classrooms.

A program designed to identify a student's 'early' commitment and dedication and dedication to Special Education was designed by Reid, Reid, Whorton, and Reichard (1972). Here college freshmen were provided with seminars and actual work experience in areas of Special Education. The authors supported the notion that the early training of specialists would facilitate their development along generic lines.

Cartwright (1972) extended innovations in training to include the regular as well as the special teacher. He stated: "The new breed of special educators implies a new breed of regular classroom teachers [p. 234]."

Special Educarors must involve themselves in the process of regular education while devising effective strategies to facilitate change in the mainstream (Reger, 1972). Reger continued support of the evolved resource teacher replacing the traditional role of the special educator by stating: "The (resource teacher) must become part of the teaching staff. Previous teaching experience is very necessary since the resource teachers must be more knowledgable than the average teacher about materials, child behavior, strategies, techniques, and management [p. 358]."

Performance based teacher education programs were advocated for use in colleges and universities for the training of Special Education personnel (Blackhurst, 1973; Shuster, 1973). Although there was general philosophical agreement among many special educators regarding the necessity of competency based and non-categorical Special Education programs, there was little consensus concerning the program's development and implementation was limited. Consequently, many states continued to certify Special Education teachers in traditional disability categories.

Blackhurst (1973) postulated an alternative to these difficulties. He suggested that a specific list of

competencies necessary for generic specialists be identified so that training models would be organized around competencies, rather than disability areas.

Nineteen seventy-two witnessed the small beginnings of the philosophical acceptance of mainstream theory. Martin (1974) warned that teacher trainers must be prepared for negative reactions from the educational establishment if programs do not begin to change. The attitudes of students, parents, and regular class teachers must positively be accurately assessed coupled with effective and efficient programs for the training of the "mainstream" teacher, for a reasonable implementation of the non-categorical philosophy of Special Education.

Although legislation mandated the development of non-categorical programs, portions of the educational establishment such as state directors of Special Education have hampered the development of innovative teacher training programs through an archaic and rigid system of certification, course requirements, and training models (Garfunkel, 1974). Schools of education must assume responsibility for the development of support systems on the preservice and inservice levels with students of both regular and Special Education training programs afforded the opportunity to delve into all aspects of the educational process. Garfunkel predicted that Special Education training programs could initiate these changes.

Lord (1974) advocated the adoption of new guidelines from federal funding agencies to charge grant receipients with the responsibility for the development of innovative delivery systems in the area of Special Education training. He also recommended inclusion of components in these training programs which could instruct auxillary personnel to provide support services to children and teachers in the regular classroom.

Reger (1974) viewed as crucial the implementation of non-categorical special programs and the systematic restructuring of teacher training programs. Reger pointed out the lack of cooperation between delivery systems and university training programs and indicated that communication was usually characterized by public relations exchange between Special Education administrators and university personnel. Input generally was not solicited from grass roots to ivory tower. Reger attempted to prove his basic assumptions by surveying the effect of communication channels between special education administrators and university personnel in the state of New York. His findings indicated that no meaningful cooperation had occurred to effect changes in teacher training programs.

The 1960's and 1970's experienced a rush of opinions concerning the training of the "new" special educator. Reynolds (1972) cited cooperation among Special Education departments in the local school districts, institutions of

higher education, and state departments as the keys to successful teacher training programs and pointed to the Consulting Teacher Model in Vermont as "the most remarkable single instance of collaboration where consulting teachers are trained by the University of Vermont and the public schools of the State [p. 183]."

Prouty and Prillaman (1967) developed the Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teacher (DPT) Program as an alternative to categorical teacher training. It was one of the first graduate level alternative training models developed in the country. The Diagnostic/Prescriptive Teacher was a trained school-based educator who served as a diagnostician-consultant to regular class teachers. The DPT Model was designed to bridge the gap between Special Education and Regular Education for the purposes of insuring an optimal educational experience for every child (Prouty & McGarry, 1973). This model was implemented at the George Washington University in Washington, D.C. and recently (1974) was incorporated into the Special Education Program at the University of Massachusetts.

One of the few non-categorical models at the undergraduate level was developed by Jackson and McArdle (1973) at the University of Massachusetts. The Classroom Based Diagnostic/Resource Teacher Program (CBDRT) trains students to complement the efforts of regular classroom teachers in maintaining special needs children within the confines of

the regular classroom setting. The CBDRT Program embraces the theoretical foundations underlying the humanistic approach toward educating those children who have been identified as having learning and/or behavioral problems.

The Consulting Teacher Program at the University of Vermont is a training model for the instruction of special educators in a generic support-to-classroom-teachers model (McKenzie, Egner, Knight, Perelman, Schneider & Garvin, 1970). Graduate students supervise practicum experiences and training consists of individualized programmed units of instruction. Consulting teachers have no direct classroom responsibilities; their primary responsibilities lie in the provision of support services to the regular class teachers. In addition, regular classroom teachers are provided with in-service training by consulting teachers in the areas of diagnosis and remediation of children with problems (Christie, 1972).

Mitchell (1971) trained six community members as Specific Instruction Personnel (SIP) and although none had college degrees, all received high ratings by regular classroom teachers and students with whom the SIP's had worked. Mitchell suggested taking a closer look at the contributions of non-professional persons in the area of special education and ultimately including para-professional training in the restructuring of special education training programs.

Shaw and Shaw (1972) advocated the development of "classroom specialists" to help regular classroom teachers develop

the skills needed to work with all children in the regular classroom. The Zero Reject Model, as it was termed at the University of Oregon, prepared specialists to design and execute inservice learning experiences for teachers who desired assistance with Special Children in their classrooms. Here classroom strategies were employed and implemented cooperatively between the specialist and classroom teacher. The classroom specialist never worked directly with a child. The University of Oregon Training Program provided potential specialists with competency based instruction in the aquisition of "classroom specialist" skills.

The Experimental Education Unit (EEU) at the University of Washington was developed as a training program to instruct regular classroom teachers as special education resource teachers who would then return to schools settings and function as resource teachers (Haring, 1971). The training program staff agreed on specific terminal objectives for each trainee such as the application of reinforcement principles to manage behavior, individualizing instruction, and programming teaching experiences. A sixteen week supervised practicum was included in the teacher training experience and exercises based on precision teaching principles were included in the training sequence.

The Harrison School Center, a Public School-University Cooperative Resource Program (Johnson & Grismer, 1973), provided for the development of a cooperative relationship

between university teacher trainers and public school personnel. Resource teachers were trained within a competency based program and were given skills in case management, individualized instruction, and support to regular classroom teachers as Special Class Children are mainstreamed into regular class settings. A modular series of instructional programs assisted the resource teacher in the developing of classroom units and activities that were used by regular class teachers with special students placed in their classes. Cooperative relationships between specialists and regular class teachers were seen as the most necessary ingredient to the development of successful resource teachers and resource programs.

The review of the literature and the supportive research surrounding the current trends and alternative models for Special Education teacher training indicate that both regular and special educators at all levels can adapt their present roles to accommodate the innovative alterantives proposed within the Special Education community.

# C H A P T E R  I I I

## DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The research data presented and analyzed in this study was collected through the responses secured through a questionnaire. Data collection involved four phases:

1. Initial contact with data sources.
2. Development and testing of the questionnaire.
3. Distribution of the questionnaire.
4. Tabulation and evaluation of the received data.

Since each phase affected the entire data collection component of the study, a clear knowledge of the background and significance of each phase is necessary.

### Description of Data Collection Components

A. Initial Contact:

Boston State College, Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Framingham, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, North Adams, Westfield, and Worcester State Colleges were the institutions included in this study. To insure understanding and cooperation from the respondents, each source received a letter providing information about the purpose, design, and scope of the study. Because all of the empirical information necessary for the study was available only through these specific sources, the letter stressed the importance of returning the questionnaire with complete and accurate information. Completed questionnaires were received from

all data sources.

The following received letters:

1. Eight chairpersons of Special Education Departments operating within the Massachusetts state college system (see Appendix A).
2. The senior staff development co-ordinator of the Springfield Regional Office of the Massachusetts State Department of Education (see Appendices A and B).
3. The senior staff development co-ordinator of the Boston Regional Office of the Massachusetts State Department of Education (see Appendices A and B).
4. The Executive Office of the Massachusetts State Department of Education located in Boston (see Appendices A and B).
5. The chairperson of the Task Force of Special Education Directors, a group which includes all special education programs operating within institutions of higher learning (see Appendices A and B).

It should be noted that one of the eight departmental chairpersons does not operate an independent special education department (North Adams). However, the particular program does produce special education teachers, so it has been included in the study.

As indicated by the list of data sources contacted, this study has a limited scope. Rather than focusing on all

operative programs in the field, the study dealt solely with programs operating within the Massachusetts state college system. The programs at the state college level emerged as the most appropriate unit of analysis and study since they have a direct responsibility to respond to the needs of the state. State institutions fall directly under the control of the State Department of Education and must follow its guidelines and mandates. These institutions are affected by the programmatic dictates of the state as well as by the State Department of Education. When fiscal cutbacks are made in the state college system, this can have a direct bearing on which training programs survive and which are reduced to an unrecognizable component.

The private institutions have the option of complying with Chapter 766. These institutions are affected insofar as they are involved in teacher certification. Many of these colleges and universities are liberal arts institutions and only offer a minimal number of courses leading to teacher certification. Some changes will be implemented at these institutions as well, but on the whole, the impact of Chapter 766 will have a greater affect upon the state institutions. It may be safe to assume, though, that the private institutions are making some effort to comply with Chapter 766.

Development and Field Testing of the Questionnaire

Several considerations played an important role in shaping the format of the questionnaire. The nature of the data collection process demanded that the collection instrument have the following characteristics:

1. Clarity - as a relatively new direction in special education, the jargon for the "mainstreaming" concept has not yet become standardized, thus an effort was made to avoid confusing terminology.
2. Objectivity - a sizable portion of the data requested is quantitative, and the questionnaire was designed to prevent purely subjective responses which might avoid the main thrust of a particular question.
3. Brevity - realizing the demands placed on the data sources, and the impersonal nature of the collection process, an attempt was made to eliminate ambiguous questions.
4. Flexibility - the questionnaire does permit and encourage verbal elaboration of certain answers dealing with quantitative matters.

Before the questionnaire was sent to the data sources, it was submitted to three individuals currently involved in special education teacher training and research. The Director of the Special Education Program at the University of Massachusetts, the Staff Development Coordinator at the Springfield

Regional Office of the Massachusetts State Department of Education, and a research person at the University of Massachusetts, independently reviewed draft copies of the questionnaire and submitted criticisms and comments. Individual meetings were held with each person, subsequent to their reviewing the questionnaire. Discussions centered around the clarity, content, and design of the questionnaire. Each person's comments were taken into consideration when the revisions were made. This procedure was adhered to after each revision of the questionnaire. A consensus was reached before the final format was agreed upon. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix C.

## Questionnaire Content

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. A brief description of each section follows.

Part I - Demography

This section solicited empirical data on the size of the instructional staff; the distribution of academic degrees held by staff members; incentives for instructional personnel retraining; size of each department in terms of students and academic level (undergraduate, inservice, and graduate); structure of the special education curriculum; changes in budget allocations related to Chapter 766; relative amounts of budgetary support from state and federal funding sources; and instructional staffing patterns based

on the sources of financial support.

Part II - Training Program Information.

Information about the components of the various training programs as they existed before and after the passage of Chapter 766 was solicited. Similar data was solicited about training models. Since the majority of Special Education epartments were or are divided into the traditional components of mental retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabilities, etc., an effort was made to determine whether or not these components have been abolished in favor of a generic component. Likewise most of the institutions' training models prepare students to teach in self-contained special classes. Chapter 766 mandated nine prototypes or alternative designs for children with special needs. One of the least desired prototypes is the self-contained special class. Consequently, the focus on the preparation of students to function in self-contained classrooms should be greatly diminished.

Part III - Inhibiting Factors in Program Development.

This section, unlike the others, solicited both objective and subjective responses. Data sources were asked to evaluate institutional governance policies as they affect the implementation of training program modifications. For example, some institutions require that courses be offered a specific length of time, or in other instances any programmatic changes which are desired must be approved via a complicated channel

process. Information was solicited to determine if indeed any of these conditions or similar deterring factors existed at the state institutions.

Also, information was solicited about the possible effects of the lack of defined new certification requirements prior to January 1975. Most programs are tailored to incorporate courses required for certification. The old requirements were null and void as of December 1974. Since the task force for certification requirements had not delineated the requirements until mid-year of the first year of full implementation, this could represent a possible deterrent for making definite programmatic changes.

The questionnaire requested subjective elaboration on these points.

# C H A P T E R I V

## THE FINDINGS

The eight colleges responding to the questionnaire provide Special Education training. The tables presented in this chapter contain the questionnaire responses from each of these institutions. Due to the nature of the data as well as the small sample, no statistical methods or tests were deemed necessary for the analysis of the questionnaire.

The data presented is divided into four sections: (a) Demography; (b) Program Practice; (c) Chapter 766 Adherence; and (d) Other Variables Affecting Acceptance and Implementation of the Mandate. The correlation between specific questionnaire items and these four areas can be seen in Appendix D.

The Demographic Information includes a description of the faculty and student population, as well as the financial allotments. The information elicited concerning Program Practices enumerates the training models and components used prior to July 1972, along with the current 1974-1975 models and components being used, and the resulting representation of change in program direction. The Chapter 766 Adherence section relates the new adaptations made by the institutions, the incentives for change, and the factors inhibiting change. The last section presenting some select Variables Influencing Change focuses on dimensions such as the student population size and the educational background

level of the faculty.

## I. Demography

Two salient features about the faculty background can be noted from Table 1. Framingham, Westfield and Boston State have the greatest number of faculty involved in the training of teachers for Children with Special Needs. Although Boston State does not have a separate Special Education Department, the psychology personnel have a major responsibility in Special Education teacher training. From the tables it is interesting to note that at least 60 percent of the faculty in five of the eight institutions have terminal degrees.

Table 2 shows the student population majoring in Special Education. Four of the eight schools appear to have the majority of students at the State institutions involved in Special Education. One institution, Framingham, requires all undergraduates trained in either early childhood education or elementary education to have a background in Generic Spacial Education. This appears unique to that institution.

As noted in Table 3, only two institutions have increased budget allocations as a result of Chapter 766. The three institutions receiving federal grants to assist them with compliance of Chapter 766 are Framingham, University of Massachusetts, and North Adams. All of these grants are for the fiscal year 1974-1975. From the table it appears

Table 1

FACULTY INFORMATION

| | Staffing Patterns | | | Educational Background | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Part-Time | Full-Time | Total | M.A. (%) | CAGS (%) | Ph.D./Ed.D (%) | |
| Boston State | 20[a] | | 20 | | 8 (40) | 12 | (60) |
| Bridgewater | | 6 | 6 | 1 (16.7) | 1 (16.7) | 4 | (66.6) |
| Fitchburg | | 11 | 11 | 2 (18) | 2 (18) | 7 | (63.6) |
| Framingham | 1 | 15 | 16 | 1 (6.3) | 5 (31.2) | 10 | (62.5) |
| UMass. | 7 | 6 | 13 | 4 (30) | 5 (40) | 4 | (30) |
| North Adams | 2 | 6 | 8 | | 1 (12.5) | 7 | (87.5) |
| Westfield | 14 | 5 | 19 | 6 (31.5) | 8 (42.3) | 5 | (26.2) |
| Worcester | | 7 | 7 | | 5 (71.5) | 2 | (28.5) |

[a]Estimated faculty training teachers for Special Needs Children.

Table 2

STUDENT POPULATION

| Institution | U[a] | I[a] | G[a] | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston State | | | 200 | 200 |
| Bridgewater | 700 | | 300 | 1000 |
| Fitchburg | 640 | | 257 | 897 |
| Framingham | b | | 23 | 23 |
| UMass. | 75 | 500[c] | 25 | 600 |
| North Adams | d | | | |
| Westfield | 464 | 200 | 250 | 914 |
| Worcester | 250 | 300 | 300 | 850 |
| TOTAL | 2129 | 1000 | 1355 | 4484 |

[a]Throughout the tables the following abbreviations are used: Undergraduates (U) students completing bachelor's degree requirements; inservice (I) students completing master's degree part-time; and graduate (G) students who are full-time master's degree candidates.

[b]All undergraduate Elementary and Early Childhood majors to take courses in Generic Special Education.

[c]Participants are limited to six (6) hours of graduate credit.

[d]Students are mainly psychology majors.

Table 3

COLLEGE FINANCIAL ALLOTMENTS

| | Budget Allocations | | Percent Spent | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Increase | No Increase | Hard Money | Soft Money | Source of Additional Funds |
| Boston State | | X | 100 | | |
| Bridgewater | | X | 100 | | |
| Fitchburg | | X | 99 | 1 | |
| Framingham | | X | 99 | 1 | EPDA, BEH |
| UMass. | X | | 40 | 60 | EPDA |
| North Adams | | X | 100 | | Title III |
| Westfield | X | | 100 | | |
| Worcester | | X | 100 | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 6 | | | |

that the University of Massachusetts is the singular institution dependent on federal funds for its operation. Two of the three grants are for training and retraining personnel in Special Education.

Table 4 indicates the number of faculty staffed through select funds for the academic years 1972 through 1974. Both Fitchburg and North Adams have maintained the majority of their staff since Chapter 766 was mandated in 1972. It appears that Framingham hired almost all of their current faculty in 1973, which makes this a relatively new staff. The University of Massachusetts has the largest number of personnel on soft money--federal funds.

## II. Program Practice

This section details the teacher training practices which occurred prior to the implementation of Chapter 766, the training components and models being used for the current 1974-1975, year as well as any change in program direction necessitated by Chapter 766 compliance.

The components delineated are areas of specialization for teacher trainees in Special Education. They are usually separate entities within a Special Education Department. The training models are the type of job preparation students in Special Education receive within each area of specialization. UMass. is the only institution which did not have a specified training program in Special Education

Table 4

NUMBER OF FACULTY STAFFED THROUGH SELECT FUNDS

| | Hard Money | | | | Soft Money | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | Total | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | Total |
| Boston State | | a | | | | | | |
| Bridgewater | | 1 | 3 | 4 | | | | 1 |
| Fitchburg | 9 | 1 | | 10 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| Framingham | | 15 | | 15 | | | 8 | 8 |
| UMass. | | 2 | 5 | 7 | | | | |
| North Adams | 5 | 1 | | 6 | | | | |
| Westfield | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | | | | |
| Worcester | | a | | | | | | |

[a]No response.

at the time Chapter 766 was mandated.

A. Past Practices.

As one can view from Table 5, four major component units emerged that students could opt for as specialization areas prior to Chapter 766. These areas were emotional disturbance, mental retardation, learning disabilities, and early childhood special education. Only two of the eight institutions offered a generic specialization.

Boston State College was the only institution training special educators solely via the Special Class Teacher odel, as is evidenced in Table 6. Fitchburg, North Adams, and Westfield offered students alternative models in addition to the Special Class Teacher Model. Bridgewater appears to have given students the widest range of options for teacher preparation.

B. Current Practices

This section presents findings concerning the practices of each Special Education Department for the current academic year, 1974-1975.

Table 7 indicates the areas of specialization each department offers as option to their student trainees. From the table, it appears that Bridgewater and Westfield offer their students the greatest number of options for specialization. The University of Massachusetts is the singular institution having a totally generic program component.

Table 5

PROGRAM COMPONENTS PRIOR TO JULY 1972

| | Emotional Disturbance | | | Mental Retardation | | | Learning Disabilities | | | Physical Handicaps | | | Multiple Handicaps | | | Early Childhood | | | Generic | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | X | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgewater | X | | X | | X | X | | X | X | X | | X | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | X | | X | | X | X | | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | | X | | | |
| Framingham | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X |
| UMass. | | a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Adams | X | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Westfield | X | X | X | | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | X | | X | X | |
| Worcester | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | |

[a]No specified training program existed in Special Education until the 1973-1974 academic year.

Table 6

TRAINING MODELS PRIOR TO JULY 1972

| | Consultant Teacher | | | Diagnostic Teacher | | | Remedial Teacher | | | Resource Teacher | | | Itinerant Teacher | | | Non-categorical Teacher | | | Special Class Teacher | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | X |
| Bridgewater | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X |
| Fitchburg | | | | | | | | | | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Framingham | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| UMass. | | | a | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| North Adams | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | X | | X | | X | X |
| Westfield | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Worcester | a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[a]Not ascertainable (NA).

Table 7

1974-1975 PROGRAM COMPONENTS

| | Emotional Disturbance | | | Mental Retardation | | | Learning Disabilities | | | Physical Handicaps | | | Multiple Handicaps | | | Early Childhood | | | Generic | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgewater | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Framingham | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | | X | | |
| UMass. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X |
| North Adams | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Westfield | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Worcester | a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[a]Not ascertainable (NA).

Table 8

1974-1975 TRAINING MODELS

| | Consultant Teacher | | | Diagnostic Teacher | | | Remedial Teacher | | | Resource Teacher | | | Itinerant Teacher | | | Non-categorical Teacher | | | Special Class Teacher | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Bridgewater | | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X |
| Fitchburg | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | |
| Framingham | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UMass. | | | | | X | X | | | | X | | | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| North Adams | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Westfield | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Worcester | a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[a]Not ascertainable.

Framingham offers a generic component for their undergraduate students only. These are the only two institutions incorporating generic as an area of specialization. Of the eight institutions, UMass., Framingham, and Westfield appear to have the greatest in-service thrust. Bridgewater reported offering all of the delineated training models for the training of their students, as can be noted in Table 8 Westfield trains their students in all but the Itinerant Teacher model.

It is interesting to note the Boston State is the only institution currently training students solely via the Special Class Teacher Model. Bridgewater, North Adams, and Westfield offer the Special Class Teacher Model along with other options.

Framingham trains their students only through the Consultant Teacher Model. The Resource Teacher Model coupled with the Diagnostic Teacher Model is offered by five of the eight institutions.

C. Change in Program Directions

Tables 9 and 10 look at the changes each institution has made in terms of program components and training models. They compare past practices with current practices in order to determine what changes have occurred.

According to the data in Table 9, Boston State College changed their program by eliminating an inservice component

Table 9

CHANGE IN TRAINING COMPONENTS[a]

| | Emotional Disturbance | | | Mental Retardation | | | Learning Disabilities | | | Physical Handicaps | | | Multiple Handicaps | | | Early Childhood | | | Generic | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | | X | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After[b] | | | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgewater | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | |
| After | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | X | | X | | | |
| After | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Framingham | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X |
| After | | | | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | | X | | |
| UMass. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Adams | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Westfield | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | |
| After | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | |
| Worcester | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | X | X | X | | | X | X | X | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[a]Before = prior to July 1972; After = 1974-1975 practices.

[b]Not ascertainable.

in Emotional Disturbance; otherwise there have been no changes in areas of specialization. Bridgewater added an inservice component in Early Childhood Education. The change at Fitchburg occurred by eliminating Multiple Handicaps and Early Childhood Education as areas of specialization. Framingham dropped their graduate level program in Learning Disabilities and their graduate and inservice level programs in Generic Special Education. They added to their program of offerings an undergraduate component in Early Childhood Special Education. The only institution which recorded no change in program components was North Adams. Westfield supplemented their offerings by including components in Multiple Handicaps for all levels and an Early Childhood component for their graduate and inservice level students. They eliminated the generic component as an area of specialization.

Boston State indicated no change in training models as shown in Table 10. The Consultant Teacher Component was eliminated as an option for undergraduates at Bridgewater. They expanded to include Non-categorical and Special Class Teacher Components in their program offerings. Three new components were added to Fitchburg's programs. They include the Consultant Teacher, Diagnostic Teacher, and Non-categorical Teacher Models. While adding those components, they dropped the Special Class Teacher Model. Framingham eliminated all of their existing models and added the Consultant

Table 10

CHANGE IN TRAINING MODELS[a]

| | Consultant Teacher | | | Diagnostic Teacher | | | Remedial Teacher | | | Resource Teacher | | | Itinerant Teacher | | | Non-categorical Teacher | | | Special Class Teacher | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Before | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridgewater | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X |
| Before | | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | | X | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | X |
| Fitchburg | | | | | | | | | | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | X | | X | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Framingham | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UMass. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | X | | | |
| Before | | | | X | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Adams | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| Before | | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Westfield | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | X | | X | X | | X |
| Before | | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | X | X | | | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Worcester | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before | b | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| After | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[a]Before = prior to July 1972; After = 1974-1975 practices.

[b]Not ascertainable.

Teacher Model as the singular offering. North Adams indicated change by adding the Diagnostic Teacher Model to their other offerings. Westfield deleted no models but added the Consultant Teacher, Diagnostic Teacher, Remedial Teacher Models as well as including inservice models in Non-categorical and Special Class Teacher.

## III. Chapter 766 Adherence

The data presented in this section delineates each institution's attempt to adhere to the Chapter 766 mandate. It is subdivided according to the new adaptations, incentives for change and inhibiting factors to change.

### A. New Adaptations

Table 11 presents the implementation necessary for programmatic changes reflecting each institution's compliance with Chapter 766. The University of Massachusetts and Worcester State were the only two institutions which developed totally new programs on all three levels, undergraduate, inservice, and graduate. Fitchburg revised its existing programs to be in compliance with the mandate. The remaining institutions varied the type of change which was made according to the level of instruction.

### B. Incentives

The incentives for personnel retraining are recorded in Table 12. Westfield State was the only institution which

Table 11

TYPE OF CHANGE IN PROGRAM DIRECTIONS

| | Totally New Program | | | New Components | | | Revision of Existing Program | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Boston State | X | | | | X | | | | X |
| Bridgewater | | X | | X | | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | | | | | | | X | X | X |
| Framingham | | | X | X | X | | | | |
| UMass. | X | X | X | | | | | | |
| North Adams | | | | X | X | | | | |
| Westfield | | | X | | X | | X | | |
| Worcester | X | X | X | | | | | | |

Table 12

INCENTIVES FOR PERSONNEL RETRAINING

| | Salary Increments | Sabbaticals | Reduced Course Load | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston State | | X | | |
| Bridgewater | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | X | X | | |
| Framingham | X | X | | a |
| UMass. | | X | | |
| North Adams | | X | X | |
| Westfield | b | | | |
| Worcester | X | X | | |

[a]Promotions.

[b]No established incentives for personnel retraining.

Table 13

ACTIVITIES USED BY PERSONNEL TO SUPPLEMENT EDUCATIONAL TRAINING

| | Additional Coursework | Inservice Workshops | Professional Workshops | Self-Study | No Response |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston State | | | X | | |
| Bridgewater | | X | X | X | |
| Fitchburg | X | | X | X | |
| Framingham | | | | | X |
| UMass. | | X | X | X | |
| North Adams | X | X | X | | |
| Westfield | X | X | | | |
| Worcester | X | | | | |

responded as having no established incentives for retraining. The data in Table 12 shows that the most common incentives are salary increments and sabbaticals.

An indication of activities used by personnel to supplement their educational training can be found in Table 13. Boston State and Bridgewater were the only two institutions who responded that none of their faculty were involved in additional coursework. The remaining institutions indicated that the faculty were engaged in one or more of the following options: additional coursework, inservice workshops, professional workshops, and self-study.

Table 14

INSTITUTIONAL INHIBITIONS RESTRAINING PROGRAMMATIC CHANGES

| | No Inhibitions | Lack of Funds to Hire Additional Personnel |
|---|---|---|
| Boston State | X | |
| Bridgewater | X | |
| Fitchburg | X | |
| Framingham | | X |
| UMass. | X | |
| North Adams | X | |
| Westfield | X | |
| Worcester | X | |

C. Inhibiting Factors

The data included in Table 14 show the institutional inhibitions to change, as well as the effect of the lack of newly defined certification requirements prior to January 1975.

Seven of the eight colleges indicated no institutional inhibiting factors for making needed changes in program directions. Framingham responded that the lack of funds to hire additional personnel hampered their implementing desired changes.

Table 15

EFFECT OF THE LACK OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

| | No Effect | Little Effect | Moderate Effect | Much Effect |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston State | | | | X |
| Bridgewater | X | | | |
| Fitchburg | | | X | |
| Framingham | | | X | |
| UMass. | | X | | |
| North Adams | | X | | |
| Westfield | | X | | |
| Worcester | | | X | |
| Total | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

According to the findings in Table 15 the lack of newly defined certification requirements appear to somewhat impede change in seven of the eight institutions. Only Bridgewater stated that it was not a factor. The majority of respondents indicated that the lack of certification requirements had little to moderate effect when planning new programs. The comments from the respondents were:

"Difficult to plan without approved requirements."

"Poor guidance from the State level!"

"Program planning hampered a bit."

"The members of the State Department of Education have continuously attempted to allieviate any problems and have kept staff informed."

## IV. Other Variables Influencing Change

For the data comparisons presented in this section, some of the colleges were classified in the same demographic category for the analysis. The colleges were grouped in two ways; first with respect to the proportion of faculty with terminal degrees and secondly by the size of their Special Education student population. Divided according to these variables, the colleges were examined with respect to the degree of change in their programs since the passage of Chapter 766.

### A. Faculty Degree Status

Table 16

CHANGE AS AFFECTED BY FACULTY WITH TERMINAL DEGREES

| | Totally New Program | | | New Component | | | Revision of Existing Program | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| 50% or more Ph.D./Ed.D's[a] | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 50% or less Ph.D./Ed.D's[b] | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

[a] Boston State, Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Framingham, North Adams.

[b] University of Massachusetts, Westfield, Worcester.

The data presented in Table 16 compares change as a result of institutions having the majority of their faculty holding terminal degrees to those programmatic changes made by institutions with less than fifty percent of their faculty holding terminal degrees. At the institutions with a higher percentage of terminal degrees, the major changes occurred in the area of developing new components to their existing programs. The institutions which have less than fifty percent of their faculty with terminal degrees made most of the changes in developing totally new programs.

B. Student Population in Special Education

Table 17

PROGRAMMATIC CHANGE BY SIZE OF STUDENT POPULATION

| | Totally New Program | New Component | Revision of Existing Program |
|---|---|---|---|
| | U I G | U I G | U I G |
| Large Schools[b] | 1[a] 2 2 | 1 1 1 | 2 1 1 |
| Small Schools | 2 1 2 | 2 3 0 | 0 1 0 |

[a]Number of programs per unit.

[b]Large = Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Westfield, Worcester.
Small = Boston State, Framingham, UMass., North Adams.

Table 17 indicates a comparison of change which occurred at the more highly populated institutions versus the changes

which occurred at the smaller colleges. It appears that the smaller colleges made most of their programmatic changes in terms of totally new programs and adding new components to their programs. The larger institutions responded more variably to these changes.

Table 18 presents the changes in program components made at institutions according to size of student population. In the larger institutions changes were made in the Early Childhood Component, adding inservice and graduate levels of instruction. None of these institutions currently have an existing generic program. The small institutions appeared to have reduced the categorical components of emotional disturbance, mental retardation, and learning disabilities. They increased their Early Childhood and Generic Components.

Table 19 indicates change in training models between the large and small institutions. There was an increase in the Consultant Teacher-graduate level, Diagnostic Teacher, Remedial Teacher, Non-categorical, and Special Class Teacher Training Models. The small schools increased their Consultant Teacher and Non-categorical Teacher Model. These institutions eliminated the Remedial Teacher Model and the Resource Teacher Model on the inservice and graduate level.

The discussion in the second part of this chapter focuses on an analysis of these findings.

Table 18

COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN PROGRAM COMPONENTS BETWEEN LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS[a]

| | Before | | | After | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| Large | | | | | | |
| Emotional Disturbance | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Mental Retardation | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Learning Disabilities | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Physical Handicaps | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Multiple Handicaps | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Early Childhood | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Generic | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small | | | | | | |
| Emotional Disturbance | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mental Retardation | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Learning Disabilities | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Physical Handicaps | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Multiple Handicaps | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Early Childhood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Generic | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

[a]According to Special Education population size: Large schools -- Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Westfield, Worcester; small schools -- Boston State, Framingham, UMass., North Adams.

[b]Number of programs per unit.

Table 19

COMPARISON OF CHANGE IN TRAINING MODELS BETWEEN LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS[a]

| | Before | | | After | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | U | I | G | U | I | G |
| **Large** | | | | | | |
| Consultant Teacher | 1[b] | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Diagnostic Teacher | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Remedial Teacher | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Resource Teacher | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| Itinerant Teacher | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Non-categorical | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Special Class | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| **Small** | | | | | | |
| Consultant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Diagnostic | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Remedial | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Resource | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Itinerant | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Non-categorical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Special Class | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

[a]According to Special Education population size: Large schools -- Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Westfield, Worcester; small schools -- Boston State, Framingham, UMass., North Adams.

[b]Number of programs per unit.

## Analysis of the Findings

The degree to which all eight colleges were homogeneous in their faculty and student backgrounds was examined by comparing the institutions on select demographic variables. Significant differences existed in the following two areas: size of student population and the number of faculty holding terminal degrees. The effect of these two variables on the change process instigated by the passage of Chapter 766 are analyzed later in this chapter.

### What programmatic changes have been implemented at the State Institutions of Higher Education?

The essence underlying this initial dimension of inquiry concerns examining Change Implementation. Institutions tended to expand their program offerings in Special Education rather than delete some existing training models. Bridgewater is a prime example. This institution now offers areas of concentration in all of the enumerated training models. This college employs the least amount of Special Education faculty, yet has the largest student population. This suggests that the student population at Bridgewater may not necessarily be trained in the specific models enumerated, but receive a potpourri of Special Education training. Perhaps it is difficult for an institution with such a small faculty/student ratio (1/160) to comprehensively train students in each training model.

It is interesting to note that Westfield reported offering a generic component prior to July 1972 but lacked that component for the current year, 1974-1975. Although this was the only component Westfield eliminated, it seems to indicate an antithesis to the State directional trend; since the State is certifying Generic Special Needs Teachers.

There is a definite increase in the Consultant Teacher, Diagnostic Teacher, and Non-categorical Teacher Training Models. This indicates a trend toward less categorical delivery systems, since these models deal with all children who are perceived to have learning and/or behavior problems. Chapter 766 mandates ten options for educating Children with Special Needs with the first three options dictating regular class placement with supportive services. These training models focus on the maintenance of children in the regular class with additional services.

Boston State appears to be the singular institution maintaining the Special Class Teacher Model as the only option for students. The degree of change within the program structure is not evidenced from the data collected.

There appears to be an increase in programs training students in Early Childhood Special Education. This is a positive direction, since Chapter 766 mandated the education of Special Needs Children beginning at age 3. Previously, very few professionals were trained in Early Childhood Special Education.

What new training features in the programs have been developed as a result of the passage of Chapter 766?

The main thrust of this second dimension is examining the adherence to Chapter 766. Two institutions developed totally new programs as a result of Chapter 766. In these two institutions the majority of faculty members lacked terminal degrees. These same institutions reported that personnel were currently involved in coursework. It seems reasonable to assume that coursework involvement keeps members more attuned to the current trends in Special Education subsequently greater innovations will occur.

The tendency toward less categorical systems for delivery of services, that is, using Generic and Non-categorical as current components and training models is evidenced at two institutions. This coincides with the strong guidelines of Chapter 766 stating that a majority of persons must be trained in a generic approach to Special Needs Children.

Five of the eight institutions indicated that personnel are currently involved in coursework. This suggests that many of the institutions are open to greater innovative strides with fresh program ideas for delivery systems being implemented, ideally culminating in a totally generic training program for all institutions.

The institutional incentives generally used for personnel retraining were salary increments and sabbaticals. Sabbaticals,

as an option, appears to be a delayed incentive, since length of service is related to leave time. Salary increments are an additional motivation for personnel to obtain a terminal degree. This implies that personnel involved in coursework would collect immediate rewards for efforts to further expand their educational background. This is one of the few institutional guarantees of support for faculty members. This coupled with personal motivation can be an effective means to inspire personnel to acquire terminal degrees.

Boston State College was the only institution indicating that the lack of certification requirements did indeed hamper programmatic changes. This college seems to have made the least amount of change when comparing past practices to current practices. No change is evident. This is one of two institutions who have no faculty involved in coursework, which makes one question the degree of educational achievement and innovation within the department.

There are alternative ways of acquiring information about new programs and directions in Special Education. For example, communication should exist among the faculty in various state institutions where the methods and techniques currently utilized are discussed. This is a specific instance where professional colleagues could interact and support their mutual attempts to discover and implement new educational directions.

Are any significant variables related to the ease or difficulty with which colleges are implementing new components of the program?

The last dimension examines Select Demographic Variables Effecting New Program Implementation. The two major variables seemingly affecting change and educational innovation, as a result of the passage of Chapter 766, are the number of faculty holding terminal degrees and the size of the student population. The relationship between the changes in program direction and the majority of faculty holding terminal degrees is not clear cut. Quite a few of the institutions with faculties holding less than 50% terminal degrees appear to have made more changes in programs. As previously stated, in institutions where less than half the faculty hold terminal degrees, personnel have been involved in coursework which would keep them abreast of new developments in Special Education. Speculatively, some of these people are less entrenched in traditional systems and have not vested as much of their energies in the "older" methods of Special Education. Attendance at classes allows for further exchange of ideas with other professionals in the field, outside of their institution. Also, these faculty members may be more willing to experiment with new and innovative approaches to education.

There appears to be an inverse relationship between the size of the student population and the number of changes

instituted at a particular college. The smaller institutions seem to have made the greatest strides towards compliance with Chapter 766. They generally offer fewer areas of specialization enabling faculty to focus energies on developing new programs and refining existing ones. The smaller schools offer less traditional training models to students. Change appears to be easier when fewer students are involved, since the communication between faculty and students can be more frequent and direct. A smaller population may permit students more input into program direction which may in turn help the faculty keep in touch with the realities in the school systems.

The passage of Chapter 766 has resulted in changes being undertaken at the college level. Consequently, the state of the art in Special Education in Massachusetts seems optomistic since all colleges have indicated that some change is occurring, despite institutional variations in the degree. Hopefully in subsequent years, even greater changes in Special Education teacher training will be further implemented.

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Summary

As a result of the passage of Chapter 766, questions arise concerning the extent to which the recommended educational practices are implemented. In this research, the specific dimensions of this problem that have been identified and evaluated concern: (1) the programmatic changes implemented at the State Institutions of Higher Education; (2) Development of new training features in the program since the mandate was passed; and (3) Effect of select variables on the changing educational practices instigated by the passage of Chapter 766.

To this end, a questionnaire was developed for the purpose of collecting information on Special Education teacher training programs at State Colleges within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and distributed to the eight chairpersons of Special Education Departments at these Institutions. The Institutions included: Boston State, Bridgewater, Fitchburg, Framingham, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, North Adams, Westfield, and Worcester State Colleges.

The questionnaire data was analyzed and discussed according to the following areas: (1) Demography; (2) Program Practices - encompassing the past practices prior

to 1972, the current 1974-1975 methods, and the resulting changes; (3) Compliance of Chapter 766 Adherence focusing on incentive for acceptance and limitations prohibiting acceptance; and (4) Other Variables Affecting Acceptance and Implementation of Chapter 766.

The results of the data analysis showing program change and implementation among the majority of colleges surveyed, will be presented more extensively in the conclusions.

## Limitations of the Data

Correct interpretations of the data and subsequent implications for educational training programs may be limited by several factors. Purposely, there were no definitions included in the questionnaire, particularly with respect to training models. Many of the models enumerated are new training models in Special Education. Although there is general consensus in the definitions of the components, such as Emotional Disturbance and Mental Retardation, no consensus exists on how to operationally define a Diagnostic Teacher and Resource Teacher, for example. It was assumed and anticipated that all held similar definition of terms. However, it is possible that the respondents differed from the research investigator in their definition of terms.

The analysis of institutional change is limited to the data collected. It is possible that additional items

which could have elicited more information may have been omitted.

## Conclusions

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has set the direction for Special Education training and practices by the passage of Chapter 766. The degree to which the State Institutions have accepted and implemented these educational changes varies. Seven of the eight institutions now incorporate non-categorical or generic training in their operational models. This is, indeed, a positive step forward. The tendency, though, was for institutions to add programs minimizing the categorical thrust (generic) to the already existing program offerings, Mental Retardation, for example.

All institutions indicated a need to alter their training programs. Two institutions developed totally new programs at all three instructional levels--undergraduate, inservice, and graduate--and one college revised its existing programs at these same levels. The remaining institutions varied the revisions for each instructional level. Therefore, as confirmed by the data, changes in the educational practices have been implemented to various degrees.

With former practices strongly questioned by many special educators and new program delivery systems designed, the salient question that emerges is: Are professionals at the college and university level presently undergoing retraining

to familiarize themselves with current developments? The major response to this query was affirmative. Five of the eight institutions have personnel currently enrolled in additional coursework. This indicates a willingness to seek further information about the present state of the art in Special Education. Institutional support for retraining generally comes via salary increments--which is an additional incentive for faculty members to persue terminal degrees and become acquainted with new methods.

The inhibiting factors to program development appeared to be the lack of newly defined certification requirements. Seven institutions indicated that this was a hinderance to further program implementation. Despite this fact, two institutions have incorporated only non-categorical training models in their program offerings. Since Chapter 766 redefines children needing special services without a specific categorical connotation, these same two institutions have apparently made greater educational innovations, with or without certification requirements being delineated.

Two demographic variables were considered when comparisons were made between institutions with respect to program change generated since the passage of Chapter 766. They were the size of the student population and the percentage of faculty holding terminal degrees. The institutions with less than half the faculty holding terminal degrees indicated the greatest amount of change in program direction. It

appears that these faculties are more involved in outside activities including coursework and are more attuned to the new developments in the field. Possibly they are less entrenched in Special Education traditions and therefore are more willing to experiment with educational innovations.

Institutions with smaller Special Education student populations had more innovative programs. Change tended towards offering less categorical components and training models. The larger colleges appear to have more difficulty changing the direction of program offerings. With a smaller number of students, it appears change can be more readily effected possibly resulting from the closer communication between faculty and students. The bureaucratic procedures within institutions can facilitate or hinder the rate of change. At smaller institutions, less bureaucracy seems to exist and does not appear to be detrimental to educational planning and advancement.

To reiterate the central finding of this research, changes are occurring at the State Institutions of Higher Education, indicating compliance with the mandate of Chapter 766. Hopefully, additional change can be forecast for the future considering the newly defined certification requirements.

## Recommendations

There are several ways in which this research can be

developed further. One suggestion would be expanding this study to include the private colleges and universities training Special Educators, within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In addition, extending this study over a two to three year time period would be valuable in further determining the effect Chapter 766 has had on Special Education teacher training.

An interesting extension to the data already collected would be to survey the graduates of past programs at a given institution in addition to the recent graduates to compare an individual's perception of changing roles and definitions of the Special Education practitioner.

Conducting an in-depth study including on-site visits, interviews with professional staff, and interviews with students would elicit more comprehensive information on the changes occurring as a result of Chapter 766.

The effect of Chapter 766 is felt not only on special educators but "regular" educators as well. All teachers must broaden their range of skills suggesting the special educators cross the mythical barriers between "Regular" and Special Education. To this end, a study investigating

changing practices in our training of elementary and secondary teachers would be an immensely valuable asset.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abeson, A. Movement and momentum: Government and the education of handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 49, 109-115.

Adamson, G., & Van Etten, G. Zero reject model revisited: A workable alternative. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 735-738.

Aiello, B. A study of special education pre-service teacher training programs in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic state teachers colleges - Or how we got where we are. Unpublished study, Council for Exceptional Children, 1974.

Bennett, A. A comparative study of the sub-normal children in the elementary grades. Teachers College Contributions to Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

Binet, A., & Simon, T. Upon the necessity of establishing a scientific diagnosis of inferior states of intelligence. Reprinted in J. J. Jenkins & D. G. Patterson (Eds.), Studies in individual differences. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.

Blackhurst, A. E., Cross, D., Nelson, C., & Tawney, J. Approximating noncategorical teacher education. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 384-288.

Blatt, B. Some persistently recurring assumptions concerning the mentally retarded. Training School Bulletin, 1960, 57, 48-59

Bradfield, R., Brown, J., Kaplan, P., Rickert, E., & Stannard, R. The special child in the regular classroom. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 384-390.

Budoff, M. Providing special education without special classes. Journal of School Psychology, 1972, 10, 199-205.

Burrello, L. A reexamination of assumptions of university teacher-training programs within a social-systems model. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8 (4), 23-24.

Burrello, L., & Schultz, E. Special education as experimental education: A new conceptualization. Exceptional Children, 1973, 40, 29-34.

Cartwright, G., & Cartwright, C Gilding the lilly: Comments on the training based model. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 231-234.

Chenault, J. Mental retardation as a function of race, sex, and social economic status. Michigan State University, 1970, Doctoral Dissertation.

Christie, L. S., McKenzie, H. S., & Burdett, C. S. The consulting teacher approach to special education: Inservice training for regular classroom teachers. Focus on Exceptional Children, 1972, 4(5).

Christopolos, F., & Valletutti, P. A noncategorical and field-competency model for teacher preparation in special education. Journal of Special Education,

1972, 6 (2), 115-120.

Collins, G. Case review: Rights of the retarded. Journal of Special Education, 1973, 7 (1), 27-37.

Combs, R. H., & Harper, J. L. Effects of labels on attitudes of educators toward handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1967, 33, 399-403.

Compton, M. Changes needed in special education. Unpublished paper, Archives of Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland, 1931.

Corarrubias v. San Diego Unified School District (Southern California), No. 70-394-T (S. D. Cal. 1971).

Deno, E. Special education as developmental capital. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 229-236.

Diana v. State Board of Education, No. C-70, 37 R F P District Court for Northern California (February, 1970).

Divoky, D. Education's latest victim: The "LD" Kid. Learning, 1974, 5(2), 20-25.

Dunn, L. M. Special education for the mildly retarded - Is much of it justified? Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 5-24.

Engel, M. The tin drum revisited. Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 381-384.

Franks, D. J. Ethnic and social status characteristics of children in EMR classes and LD classes. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 537-538.

Gallagher, J. J. The special education contract for mildly handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 527-535.

Garfunkel, F. Render to the schools what is theirs. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8 (1), 43-45.

Garrison, M., & Hammill, D. D. Who are the retarded? Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 13-20.

Gilhool, T. Education: An inalienable right. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 597-609.

Glavin, J., Quay, H., Annesley, F., & Werry, J. An experimental resource room for behavior problem children. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 131-137.

Hall, E. The politics of special education. Inequality in Education. Harvard Center for Law and Education, 1970, 3(4), 17-22.

Hammons, G. W. Educating the mildly retarded: A review. Exceptional Children, 1972, 3, 527-535.

Haring, N. A strategy for the training of resource teachers for handicapped children. In M. C. Reynolds & M. D. Davis (Eds.), Exceptional children in regular classrooms. Minneapolis, Minn.: LTI/Special Education, University of Minnesota, 1971.

Harshman, H. Influencing teacher-training programs: A possible model. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8, 33-37.

Hobson v. Hansen, (Washington, D. C.), 269F Supp. 401 (1967).

Hurley, O. The categorical/noncategorical issue: Implications for teacher trainers. In The categorical/noncategorical issue: Implications for teacher education: Conference proceedings, University of Missouri - Columbia, 1971.

Iano, R. Shall we disband special education classes? Journal of Special Education, 1972, 6 (2), 167-177.

Jackson, R. D., & McArdle, K. The classroom based diagnostic/resource teacher program. Unpublished brochuer, University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Johnson, G. O. Special education for the mildly retarded - A paradox. Exceptional Children, 1962, 29, 62-69.

Johnson, J. L. Special education for the inner city: A challenge for the future or another means for cooling the mark out? Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 241-251.

Johnson, E., & Crismer, R. The Harrison School center: A public school - university cooperative resource program. In E. Deno (Ed ), Instructional alternatives for exceptional children. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Jones, R. L. Labels and stigma in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 553-564.

Kirk, S. A. Research in education. In H. A. Stevens & R. Heber (Eds.), Mental retardation. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1964.

Knoblock, P. Open education for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1973, 40, 358-365.

Kolstoe, O. P. Programs for the mildly retarded: A reply to the critics. Exceptional Children, 1968, 38, 5-22.

Kraft, A. Down with (most) special education classes! Academic Therapy, 1973, 8, 207-216.

Lilly, M. S. Special education: A teapot in a tempest. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 43-49.

Lilly, M. S. A training based model for special education. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 745-749.

Lord, F. Categories and mainstreaming in special education: Perspectives and critique. In S. Kirk & F. Lord (Eds.), Exceptional children: Resources and perspectives. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Martin, E. Some thoughts on mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 1974, 41, 150-153.

McKenzie, H., Egner, A. N., Knight, M. F., Perelman, P. F., Schneider, B. M., & Garvin, J. S. Training consultant teachers to assist elementary teachers in the management and education of handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 37, 137-143.

Mercer, J. R. The ecology of mental retardation. In

Proceedings of the first annual spring conference of the institute for the study of mental retardation, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1970, 55-74.

Meyerowitz, J. H. Family background of educable, mentally retarded children. In H. Goldstein, J. W. Moss, & J. L. Jordan (Eds.), The efficacy of special education training on the development of mentally retarded children. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Institute for Research on Exceptional Children, 1965, 152-182.

Meyerowitz, J. H. Peer groups and special classes. Mental Retardation, 1967, 5, 23-26.

Miller, J., & Schoenfelder, D. A rational look at special class placement. Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 397-403.

Mitchell, M. M. Teacher education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1971, 6, 177-184.

Nelson, C., & Schmidt, L. The question of the efficacy of special classes. Exceptional Children, 1971, 39, 381-384.

Pertsch, C. F. A comparative study of the progress of subnormal pupils in grades and in special classes. Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936.

President's Committee on Mental Retardation. The six-hour retarded child. Washington, D. C.: The President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1969.

Prouty, R. W.,& Prillaman, D. Educational diagnosis: In clinic or classroom? Virginia Journal of Education, 1967, 67 (3), 10-12.

Prouty, R. W.,& Prillaman, D. Diagnostic teaching: A modest proposal. Elementary School Journal, 1970, 70, 265-270.

Prouty, R. W., & McGarry, F. N. The diagnostic/prescriptive teacher. In E. Deno (Ed.), Instructional Alternatives for Exceptional Children. Arlington, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1973.

Reger, R. The questionable role of the specialists in special education. Journal of Special Education, 1966, 1, 53-59.

Reger, R., Schroeder, W., & Uschold, D. Special education: Children with learning problems. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Reger, R. Resource rooms: Change agents or guardians of the status quo? Journal of Special Education, 1972, 6, 355-359.

Reger, R. How can we influence teacher training programs? Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8, 7-13.

Reid, W., Reid, B., Whorton, J., & Reichard, C. An experimental special education program for college freshmen. Journal of Special Education, 1972, 6, 127-133.

Reynolds, M. C. A framework for considering some issues in

special education. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28, 367-370.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). Psychology and the process of schooling in the next decade: Alternative conceptions. Washington, D. C.: Leadership Training Institute/ Special Education, 1971.

Reynolds, M. C., & Balow, B. Categories and variables in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 357-366.

Roos, P. Evaluation of operant conditioning with institutionalized retarded children. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1970, 74, 325-330.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968.

Ross, S. L., DeYoung, H., & Cohen, J. Confrontation: Special education placement and the law. Exceptional Children, 1971, 38, 5-12.

Rubin, R., Krus, P., & Balow, B. Factors in special class placement. Exceptional Children, 1973, 39, 523-532.

Rusalem, H. The special teacher on the interdisciplinary team. Exceptional Children, 1959, 26, 180-181.

Sarason, S. Again: The preparation of teachers and the problem of change. In M. C. Reynolds, Psychology and the process of schooling in the next decade: Alternative conceptions. Washington, D. C.: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education, 1971.

Shaw, S., & Shaw, W. Zero reject model. Journal of Special Education, 1972, 6, 125-130.

Shuster, S. Proposed performanced based training program for special education teachers. Viewpoints, 1973, 49, 25-50.

Smith, J.,& Arkans, J. Now more than ever: A case for the special class. Exceptional Children, 1974, 40, 497-502.

Snapp, M. Resource classrooms or resource personnel? Journal of Special Education, 1972, 6, 383-387.

Szasz, T. The uses of naming and the origin of the myth of mental Illness. American Psychologist, 1961, 16, 59-65.

Tyler, R. W. Education of teachers: A look at the past and the future. In L. Rubin (Ed.) Improving inservice education: Proposals and procedures for change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Vacc, N. A study of the emotionally disturbed children in regular and special classes. Exceptional Children, 1968, 35, 197-204.

Vacc, N. Long term effects of special class intervention for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39, 399-403.

Vallett, R. The learning resource center for exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 1970, 38, 527-530.

Valletutti, P. Integration vs. segregation: A useless dialectic. Journal of Special Education, 1969, 3, 405-408.

Vergason, G. Accountability in special education. Exceptional Children, 1973, 40, 367-373.

Weigerink, R. A reaction to "How to influence teacher training programs." Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8, 33-37.

Yates, J. R. Model for preparing regular classroom teachers for "mainstreaming." Exceptional Children, 1973, 40, 471-472.

# APPENDIX A

## Letter Accompanying Questionnaire Sent to Chairpersons and State Department Representatives

February 6, 1975

here are a number of programs within the Commonwealth which have as their purpose the training of teachers for special needs children. There seem to be differences in programs designed to train such teachers, as well as the roles in which they function in schools.

I am making an effort to determine what effect the passage of Chapter 766 has had upon the teacher training programs at the State Colleges and Universities. Chapter 766 mandates alternative types of teacher training and requests those institutions to cooperate with the State Department. The enclosed survey can help us, as teacher trainers, open lines to communicate as well as be useful tools for presenting our needs to the State Department. It is not intended to be judgmental but simply a survey of what is transpiring at the State teacher training institutions.

I am including a copy of the brief questionnaire which I would appreciate your completing and returning by February 10, 1975. You may indicate the name of your institution on the front of this survey.

If you are interested in the results of this survey, please inform me and I will be happy to send you a copy when the results are tabulated.

Thank you for the courtesy of an immediate reply.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McArdle, Staff Assistant
Special Education Program

nmb
Enclosure

# APPENDIX B

## Letter Accompanying Questionnaire Sent to State Department Representatives

February 6, 1975

Enclosed you will find a copy of the packet distributed to the Chairpersons of Special Education Departments, at the State Colleges and Universities. The purpose of this survey is to determine the needs of the teacher training institution and the effect Chapter 766 has had upon their teacher training programs.

I thought you might be interested in the type of information I am seeking to collect.

If you have any questions about the survey, or would like a copy of the results, please don't hesitate to get in touch with me. This information can be useful to all of us. You may call me at 545-3508.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Kathleen McArdle, Staff Assistant
Special Education Program

nmb

# APPENDIX C

Survey of Special Education Training Programs
at the State Colleges in the Commonwealth of
Massachusetts relative to Chapter 766.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to survey the present state of the art in special education training programs; and to ascertain some of the needs and problems of training programs as related to the implementation of Chapter 766. It is not judgmental in any way.

Upon completion of the following questions please feel free to add any additional information and comments you deem useful to this survey.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Part I: Demographic Information

1. Please indicate the size of your present instructional staff.

_____a. Full-time

_____b. Part-time

2. Please indicate (by highest degree obtained) the educational background of your present staff. (Indicate by numbers)

_____a. BA

_____b. MA or M.Ed.

_____c. CAGS or 6th year

_____d. Ph.D. or Ed.D

3. Does your institution have established incentives for instructional personnel retraining?

_____a. yes

_____b. no

3a. If yes, what are they?

_____a. Salary increments

_____b. Sabbaticals

_____c. Reduced course load

_____d. Other (Specify)_____

4. As a result of Chapter 766 and mainstreaming, are any personnel presently supplementing their training background?

_____a. yes

_____b. no

_____c. unsure

4a. If yes, please indicate numbers of persons for each category.

_____a. Additional course work

_____b. Additional coursework towards a terminal degree

_____c. Inservice workshops

_____d. Professional workshops offered outside the college

_____e. Self-study

_____f. Other (Specify)_____

5. Please indicate the present student population of your Special Education department.

_____a. Undergraduate

_____b. Inservice

_____c. Graduate

6. Are all required special education courses offered within the Special Education department?

_____a. yes

_____b. no

7. If any required courses are offered in conjunction with other departments, please specify:

| Course Title | Dept. Responsible | Level UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Did your budget allocation increase as a result of 766 for fiscal year 1975?

_____a. yes

_____b. no

9. What percent of your budget is:

_____a. Hard money

_____b. Soft money

10. If you have received additional funds for program development, as a result of Chapter 766, please indicate:

a. Funding source_____

b. Proposal title_____

c. Effective dates_____

11. Please indicate instructional staffing patterns for: (indicate number of persons)

| | Hard Money | Soft Money |
|---|---|---|
| a. 1972-1973 | _____ | _____ |
| b. 1973-1974 | _____ | _____ |
| c. 1974-1975 | _____ | _____ |

Part II: Training Program Information; Prior to July 1972, and the Current Academic Year (1974-75)

Directions: For the purposes of this questionnaire, undergraduate, (UG) are those students completing bachelor's degree requirements; Inservice (IN) students are those working on a master's degree part-time; and graduate students (GR) are full-time master's degree candidates.

1. Have you found it necessary to develop any new special education teacher training components as a result of Chapter 766?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Undergraduate | (UG) | _____yes | _____no |
| b. Inservice | (IN) | _____yes | _____no |
| c. Graduate | (GR) | _____yes | _____no |

1a. If yes, did you develop:

| | (UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. A totally new program | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. A new component of the program | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. A revision of the existing program | _____ | _____ | _____ |

2. What components of the training program(s) existed prior to the passage of Chapter 766, July 1972?

| | UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Emotionally disturbance | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| b. Mental retardation | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| c. Learning disabilities | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| d. Physical handicaps | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| e. Visual impairments | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| f. Multiple handicaps | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| g. Early childhood (Sp. Ed.) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| h. Generic | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| i. Other (specify)_____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

3. Which training models were utilized prior to the passage of Chapter 766, July 1972?

| | UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Consultant teacher | | | |
| b. Diagnostic teacher | | | |
| c. Remedial teacher | | | |
| d. Resource teacher | | | |
| e. Itinerant teacher | | | |
| f. Non-categorical teacher | | | |
| g. Special class teacher | | | |
| h. Other (specify)_____ | | | |

4. What components of the training program(s) exist now?

| | UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Emotional disturbance | | | |
| b. Mental retardation | | | |
| c. Learning disabilities | | | |
| d. Physical handicaps | | | |
| e. Visual impairments | | | |
| f. Multiple handicaps | | | |
| g. Early childhood (Sp.Ed.) | | | |
| h. Generic | | | |
| i. Other (specify)_____ | | | |

5. Which training model(s) is the department using during the current academic year, 1974-75?

| | UG | IN | GR |
|---|---|---|---|
| a. Consultant teacher | | | |
| b. Diagnostic teacher | | | |
| c. Remedial teacher | | | |
| d. Resource teacher | | | |
| e. Itinerant teacher | | | |
| f. Non-categorical teacher | | | |
| g. Special class teacher | | | |
| h. Other (specify)_____ | | | |

6. Please indicate the number of credit hours per training program required for undergraduates, inservice, and graduates.

| * | MR | ED | LD | PH | VI | MH | EC | GEN | OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G | b** | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| | a** | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| N | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |
| R | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b | b |
| | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a | a |

**b=before 766, a=after 766

*refer to questions II2, and II4 for horizontal categories labelled above

Part III: Inhibiting Factors in Program Development

1. Have the governance policies at your institution inhibited you from initiating changes in training programs?

_____a. yes

_____b. no

1a. If yes, check all that apply (please feel free to elaborate)

_____a. Program approval system

_____b. Course approval system

_____c. Other (specify)_____

2. How much effect has the lack of certification requirements had on your training programs? (please elaborate)

_____a. No effect

_____b. Little effect

_____c. Moderate effect

## APPENDIX D

### Correlation Between Tables and Questionnaire Items

| Questionnaire Item | | Finding Area |
|---|---|---|
| I. | | |
| 1. | Faculty Size | Demography |
| 2. | Faculty Educational Background | Demography/Variables Influencing Change |
| 3. | Institutional Incentives | Chapter 766 Adherence |
| 4. | Personnel Retraining | Chapter 766 Adherence |
| 5. | Student Population | Demography/Variables Influencing Chang |
| 8. | Budget Allocation | Demography |
| 9. | Budget-Hard/Soft Money | Demography |
| 10. | Additional Funds | Demography |
| 11. | Staffing Patterns | Demography |
| II. | | |
| 1. | New Program Directions | Chapter 766 Adherence |
| 2. | Components Prior to July 1972 | Program Practices |
| 3. | Training Models Prior to July 1972 | Program Practices |
| 4. | 1974-1975 Program Components | Program Practices |
| 5. | 1974-1975 Training Models | Program Practices |
| III. | | |
| 1. | Institutional Inhibitions | Chapter 766 Adherence |
| 2. | Effect of Lack of Certification Requirements | Chapter 766 Adherence |